

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

RICHARD SIGALA,

Applicant,

v.

No. CV 10-540 LH/WDS

ERASMO BRAVO, et al.,

Respondents.

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL**

THIS MATTER comes before the court on Applicant's Motion For the Appointment of Counsel. (Document #3) 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(1) provides that the court may request an attorney to represent any person unable to afford counsel. The Court has broad discretion to appoint counsel for indigents under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), and its denial of counsel will not be overturned unless it would result in fundamental unfairness impinging on due process rights. *Long v. Shillinger*, 927 F.2d 525, 527 (10th Cir. 1991). In determining whether to appoint counsel, the district court should consider a variety of factors, including the merits of the litigant's claims, the nature of the factual issues raised in the claims, the litigant's ability to present his claims, and the complexity of the legal issues raised by the claims. *Id.*

The Court has considered the factors noted above, and sees no basis for the appointment of counsel at this time. Accordingly, the Court orders Applicant's Motion For Appointment of Counsel (Document #3) denied without prejudice.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**



---

**W. DANIEL SCHNEIDER**  
United States Magistrate Judge